From: Kenny Crump

Reply To: <u>KennyCrump@email.com</u>

To: 'Ginsberg, Gary'; Ravi Subramaniam/DC/USEPA/US@EPA

Cc: Chao Chen/DC/USEPA/US@EPA; dhattis@fb) (6) Jennifer Jinot/DC/USEPA/US@EPA; Paul

White/DC/USEPA/US@EPA

**Subject:** RE: paper on NAS review **Date:** 06/09/2011 02:40 PM

Attachments: Subraman Lett June 2011 ksc mods.doc

```
Here are my mods to the version I received from Gary. Mainly editorial changes but a few substantial ones. I like the idea of a commentary in EHP.
Kennv
Kenny S. Crump
Louisiana Tech
P.O. Box 10348
Ruston, LA 71272-0046
Cell: 318-278-9426
FAX: 318-257-2182
KennyCrump@email.com
Home:
Kenny and Shirley Crump
2220 S. Vienna
Ruston, LA 71270
318-255-7058
> ----Original Message----
> ----Original Message----
> From: Ginsberg, Gary [mailto:Gary.Ginsberg@po.state.ct.us]
> Sent: Wednesday, June 08, 2011 5:27 PM
> To: Subramaniam.Ravi@epamail.epa.gov
> Cc: Chen.Chao@epamail.epa.gov; dhattis@b (6);
> Jinot.Jennifer@epamail.epa.gov; KennyCr il.com;
> White.Paul@epamail.epa.gov
> Subject: RE: paper on NAS review
> Ravi - yes, i thought the hockey stick should appear in the blowup portion
of
> Fig2 if poss since the Conolly "conservative" assumption should be > contrasted with the slope variants used in other runs. I think it would
> excellent commentary for EHP but if we go in that direction it may need a
> more up front context on why all this technical mumbo jumbo matters to > public health practitioners and what was the NAS overall charge and > conclusions re formaldehyde before getting into these specific BBDR
issues.
> Gary
> From: Subramaniam.Ravi@epamail.epa.gov
> From: Subramaniam.Ravigepamail.epa.gov
| [Subramaniam.Ravigepamail.epa.gov]
> Sent: Wednesday, June 08, 2011 9:38 AM
> To: Ginsberg, Gary
> Cc: Chen.Chao@epamail.epa.gov; dhattis
| Jinot.Jennifer@epamail.epa.gov; Kennyd
> White.Paul@epamail.epa.gov
> Subject: RE: paper on NAS review
> Thanks. Wow, you folks are fast! I have not looked at the body of your
edits
> but thought I would clarify a point you have in the email first.
> MO is the baseline run of Conolly; i.e. the I-cell replication rate for
    derived from his J-shape curve for N cells, and is the MLE he so derives.
His
> J-shape for N cells is derived from an average over all sites weighted by > exposure time. We preferred to call it MO rather than Conolly baseline for > "optical" reasons; i.e. as far as the estimation of these curves is
concerned
> M0 is no different from M1. Somehow people are looking at his baseline
> assumption and treating any departure from that hallowed curve as less > preferred on biological grounds. So I thought I would state this only at
the
> very end.
>
> I did not understand your point on putting in the Conolly hockey stick
> The grey line labeled "Conolly conservative" in Figure 4 is the upper
> obtained his conservative assumption of cell division rate for N cells and
> cells. Did you mean we should indicate it in Figure 2 also?
> I like your point on how the rebuttal should appear. It would be nice > have your input as a co-author because one of the charges I have heard > expressed *publicly* (most recently in the last Alliance for Risk
                                                                                                       It would be nice to
Assessment
  conference) is that NCEA's evaluation of this so-called "best developed
BBDR
^{\hspace{-0.5cm}\text{\tiny DBDR}} > model to-date" has only included statisticians who fail to consider the ^{\hspace{-0.5cm}\text{\tiny >}} biology.
```

```
> (Embedded image moved to file: pic21968.gif)
> Ravi Subramaniam
   Environmental Health Scientist
> NCEA-Washington, ORD, EPA
> N-7934, Two Potomac Yard, Crystal City
> (703) 347-8606, (301) 515-2701 (alternate office)
                   "Ginsberg <Gary.Gins state.
"dhattis(b) (6) (6) (6) (6) (6) (6) (6) (7) (8)
> From:
                                                                                       .state.ct.us>
   To:
                   Jennifer Jinot/DC/USEPA/US@EPA, "KennyCrump@email.com"
                 > Subject:
                                 RE: paper on NAS review
> Ravi - I like this response to NAS and think it would be best placed as a > commentary rather than a letter to the editor. If this journal doesn't
> commentaries you may want to consider another one because some (like > EHP) do so. In fact EHP published a commentary from me and > Deb Rice several yrs ago about a different NAS report. My comments are > in track changes attached - in addition, as you are describing M0-M5 in
> and 2, you may want to put in the Connolly hockey stick assumed slope - my > initial assumption was that MO would be the baseline run of Connolly but > that is obviously wrong but not clear what that would look like. I also
> it needs short direct rebuttal statements to the NAS points as they are > brought up and then have your explanations follow. > My co-authorship on this would seem superfluous but I don't object to
being
> listed as such. Gary
> From: dhattis@aol.com [dhattis(b) (6) ]
> Sent: Monday, June 06, 2011 12
> To: Subramaniam.Ravi@epamail.epa.gov
> Cc: Ginsberg, Gary; Jinot.Jennifer@epamail.epa.gov;
> KennyCrump@email.com; White.Paul@epamail.epa.gov;
> Chen.Chao@epamail.epa.gov
> Subject: Re: paper on NAS review
> Dear Ravi.
> Attached are some minor editing comments on you draft. I don't mind being > included as a co-author, but I think my contributions could be adequately > covered in an acknowledgement.
> Best wishes,
> Dale
   ----Original Message----
> From: Chen.Chao@epamail.epa.gov
> To: Subraman ; @epamail.epa.gov

> Cc: dhattis(b) (6); Gary.Ginsberg@po.state.ct.us;

> Jinot.Jennii ; Gary.Ginsberg@po.state.ct.us;

> White.Paul@epamail.epa.gov; KennyCrump@email.com;

> White.Paul@epamail.epa.gov

> Sent: Mon, Jun 6, 2011 12:03 pm

> Subject: Re: paper on NAS review
> Hi Ravi:
> The draft looks very good. I wish we can invite the NAS panelists who made > comments, in particular the Com #1 to debate. > I have made some comments in the text (attached below).
> (See attached file: Chao-Letter.re.NASreview.docx)
                 Ravi Subramaniam/DC/USEPA/US
> From:
mailto:Gary.Ginsberg@po.state.ct.us>,
> Chao Chen/DC/USEPA/US@EPA
> Date: 06/03/2011 03:32 PM
> Subject:
                         paper on NAS review
```

```
> Attached is a paper that Kenny and I have been working on which is a response to the NAS comments on the use of the Conolly et al. BBDR modeling for EPA's formaldehyde risk assessment. This is an initial draft. Please send Kenny and me your comments and suggestions for improvement. Please confirm that you would like to be co-authors on this. Figures are in the attached powerpoint file. Also your suggestion as to where it could be submitted. We were thinking we could submit it as a letter to the editor in the Annals of Occup Hygiene where our previous paper and exchange with Conolly appeared. It has become kind of long now, so it could possibly stand as a paper on its own.

> Ravi.

> Ravi.

> Ravi Subramaniam

> Environmental Health Scientist

NCEA-Mashington, ORD, EPA

> N-7934, Two Potomac Yard, Crystal City

> (703) 347-8606, (301) 515-2701 (alternate office)

> [attachment "Figures rev2.pptx" deleted by Chao Chen/DC/USEPA/US]

> [attachment "Letter.re.NASreview.docx" deleted by Chao Chen/DC/USEPA/US]

> [attachment "Subraman Lett June 2011.doc" deleted by Ravi

> Subramaniam/DC/USEPA/US]
```